Lerner v. Commissioner, 71 T. C. 290 (1978)

A corporation can deduct rent paid to a trust for necessary business equipment, and income from such rent is taxable to the trust's beneficiaries, not the grantor.

Summary

Dr. Lerner transferred medical equipment to a trust for his children, which then leased the equipment to his professional corporation. The Tax Court held that the rent paid by the corporation was deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense. Additionally, the court ruled that the trust's income was taxable to the beneficiaries, not Dr. Lerner, as he did not retain control over the trust's assets. This case clarifies the tax implications of transferring business assets to a trust and leasing them back to a corporation, emphasizing the importance of independent trustee management.

Facts

Dr. Hobart A. Lerner, an ophthalmologist, incorporated his practice into Hobart A. Lerner, M. D. , P. C. on September 21, 1970. He paid $500 for all the corporation's stock. On October 1, 1970, he created a trust for his children, transferring his medical equipment and furnishings to it. The trust was irrevocable and set to terminate after 10 years and 1 month, with the corpus reverting to Dr. Lerner. The trust's attorney, Samuel Atlas, served as trustee. The trust leased the equipment to the corporation for a 10-year term at $650 per month, later increased to $750. The trustee used the rental income to purchase additional equipment for the corporation, which was also leased back.

Procedural History

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the corporation's rental deductions and taxed the rent as income to Dr. Lerner. Dr. Lerner and the corporation petitioned the U. S. Tax Court. The Tax Court consolidated the cases and ruled in favor of the petitioners, allowing the deductions and taxing the trust income to the beneficiaries.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the rent paid by the corporation to the trust for the use of medical equipment is an ordinary and necessary business expense deductible by the corporation.
2. Whether the rental income received by the trust is taxable to the beneficiaries of the trust or to Dr. Lerner.

Holding

1. Yes, because the equipment was necessary for the corporation's operations, and

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

the rent was reasonable.
2. No, because the trust was valid, and Dr. Lerner did not retain control over the trust's assets, thus the income is taxable to the trust's beneficiaries.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court found that the corporation was entitled to deduct the rent as it was necessary for its business operations, and the rent was reasonable. The court emphasized that the corporation, as a separate taxable entity, was not barred from deducting rent paid to a trust for necessary equipment. The court also rejected the Commissioner's argument to disregard the trust and tax the income to Dr. Lerner, noting that Dr. Lerner did not retain control over the trust's assets. The trust was managed by an independent trustee, and the court found no evidence of Dr. Lerner using the trust's income for his own benefit. The court also distinguished this case from others where the grantor retained control over the trust property, citing the criteria from Mathews v. Commissioner for determining the validity of gift-leaseback arrangements.

Practical Implications

This decision reinforces the principle that a corporation can deduct rent paid to a trust for necessary business assets, provided the trust is managed independently. It also clarifies that income from such arrangements is taxable to the trust's beneficiaries if the grantor does not retain control over the trust's assets. Practitioners should ensure that trusts are structured with independent trustees and that the grantor does not use trust income for personal benefit to avoid adverse tax consequences. This ruling may encourage professionals to utilize trusts in business planning to minimize taxes while ensuring compliance with tax laws. Subsequent cases, such as Serbousek v. Commissioner, have followed the Tax Court's criteria approach in similar situations.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.